

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed June 19, 2006 has been received and reviewed. By the present Response, Claims 8 and 9 are canceled, Claims 1-3, 12-15, 17, 19-21, 23, 24, 26, and 30 are amended, and new Claims 41 and 42 are added. Currently pending in the application, then, are Claims 1-7, 10-24, 26-27, and 29-42, of which Claims 1, 17, 19, 26, 30, and 33 are independent. No new matter has been introduced by this Response. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration.

Non-Finality of this Action

The Office Action Summary has checked both boxes for “final” and “non-final.” According to the Image File Wrapper in the online records of the USPTO, this action is “non-final,” and the Applicant has responded accordingly and in good faith.

Claim Objections

Claims 17 and 24 are objected to for minor informalities. These informalities have been corrected. Accordingly these objections are overcome.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

Claims 19, 21, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1102(b) as being anticipated by Stuart (US-5617932). Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1102(b) as being anticipated by Seats (US-6243979). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, with the rejections discussed below by claim set.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Seats (US-6243979) in view of Fargason (US-5983913) and Dauphinee (previously cited US-2511497). Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Seats (US-6243979) in view of Fargason (US-5983913) and Dauphinee

(previously cited US-2511497) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Donnelly (previously cited US-3766844). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Seats (US-6243979) in view of Fargason (US-5983913) and Dauphinee (previously cited US-2511497) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Vickers (previously cited US-5678247). Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Seats (US-6243979) in view of Fargason (US-5983913) and Dauphinee (previously cited US-2511497) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shelton (previously cited US-6434877). Claim 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Seats (US-6243979) in view of Fargason (US-5983913) and Dauphinee (previously cited US-2511497) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Stuart (US-5617932). Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Stuart (US-5617932) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Shelton (previously cited US-6434877). Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Seats (US-6243979) as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Shelton (previously cited US-6434877). Claims 30-32, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Dauphinee (previously cited US-2511497) in view of Neugebauer (US-2003/0012563). Claims 8 and 9 are canceled. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the remaining claims, with the rejections discussed below by claim set.

Regarding the scent-elimination hunting system claims, independent Claim 1 is amended to generally recite the side and bottom panels that seal to the tree as defined in Claims 14 and 15, which were indicated to be allowable if rewritten to include all of the elements of Claim 1. The specifics of the side and bottom sealing are not included in Claim 1, but instead are included in dependent Claims 14 and 15. The Applicant respectfully submits that the hunting blind with side and bottom airflow-minimizing sealing to the tree of Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. For this reason, amended Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 2-16 and

18 are dependent from Claim 1, so these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Regarding the hunting blind claims, independent Claim 19 is amended to generally recite the bottom panel seal of Claim 20, which was indicated to be allowable if rewritten to include all of the elements of Claim 19. The specifics of the side and bottom seals are not included in Claim 19, but instead are included in dependent Claims 19, 41, and 42. The Applicant respectfully submits that the hunting blind with the side and bottom airflow-minimizing sealing to the tree of Claim 19 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. For this reason, amended Claim 19 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 20-24 and 41-42 are dependent from Claim 19, so these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Regarding the hunting blind support unit claims, independent Claim 26 is amended to more narrowly define the hunting blind that the blind support frame is specially adapted for use with. None of the cited references provide a suggestion or motivation for adapting a blind support frame for use with the new hunting blind recited in the preamble. For this reason, amended Claim 26 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 27 and 29 are dependent from Claim 26, so these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Regarding the filtration unit claims, independent Claim 30 is amended to more narrowly define the hunting blind that the filtration unit is specially adapted for use with. None of the cited references mention hunting generally, and certainly there is no suggestion or motivation in the cited references for adapting a filtration unit for use with the new hunting blind recited in the preamble. For this reason, amended Claim 30 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 31, 32, 38, and 39 are dependent from Claim 30, so these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15, 17, and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 15 is not rewritten into independent form, as its base Claim 1 as amended is believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above.

Claim 17 is rewritten into independent form, including all the elements of base Claim 1. So Claim 17 is now in condition for allowance.

Claim 20 is not rewritten into independent form, as its base Claim 19 as amended is believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 33-37 and 40 are allowed. No amendments are made to these claims.

Miscellaneous Amendments

Various claims include minor amendments made to provide antecedent basis and/or to make minor corrections.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments submitted herein and the above comments, it is believed that all grounds of rejection are overcome and that the application has now been placed in full condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits early and favorable action. Should there be any further questions or reservations, the Examiner is urged to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney at (770) 984-2300.

Respectfully submitted,

/jwg/
John W. Greenwald
Reg. No. 41,803

Customer Number 23506
GARDNER GROFF SANTOS & GREENWALD, P.C.
Tel: 770/984-2300
Fax: 770/984-0098